



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/910,663	07/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Hubbell	266/013	4623 L6
.29000	7590	06/20/2003		
IRELL & MANELLA LLP 1800 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 900 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067			EXAMINER	SZEKELY, PETER A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/910,663	HUBBELL ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Peter Szekely	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 - 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority.

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application); the disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Since U.S. Patent Applications 07/870,540 (abandoned), 07/958,870 (U.S. Patent 5,529,914), 08/022,687 (U.S. Patent 5,410,016), 08/336,393 (U.S. Patent 5,820,882) and 08/379,848 (U.S. Patent 5,626,863), do not contain any subject matter regarding a biocompatible mixture containing at least one ionically crosslinkable component and at least one covalently crosslinkable component, the effective filing date of the instant application is August 1, 1995. The claimed subject matter has to be present in every link of the continuation chain in order to establish priority. Applicants cannot jump over the gaps and reach back for subject matter into earlier applications, which they have given up by failing to incorporate it in subsequent specifications. Furthermore the patent numbers of those applications, which have matured into U.S. Patents, should be included in the first paragraph of the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1714

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nisshinbo Industries Inc. EP 0 555 980.

3. Nisshinbo discloses a water-soluble polymer and an oligosaccharide in the Abstract, and ionic and covalent crosslinking on page 3, lines 15-16.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in–
(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

5. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Desai et al.

5,334,640, Desai et al. 5,550,178, Soon-Shiong et al. 5,705,270, Soon-Shiong et al.

5,700,848, Gunther et al. 5,736,595, Soon-Shiong et al. 5,837,747, Soon-Shiong et al.

5,846,530 or Mathiowitz et al. 5,985,254

6. Desai et al. ('640) teach applicants' invention in claim 1. The contents of Desai et al. ('178) are the same. Soon-Shiong et al. recite microcapsules in claim 1, polysaccharides in claim 5, ionically and covalently crosslinked biocompatible material in claim 9. The contents of the other three Soon-Shiong et al. patents are similar. Gunther et al. divulge a polysaccharide, a water-soluble monomer, and ionic and

covalent crosslinking agents in the Abstract. Mathiowitz et al. reveal ionically and covalently crosslinkable polymers in column 3, lines 6-7, and polysaccharides in column 4, lines 48-49.

Double Patenting

7. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101, which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 19 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,334,640. This is a double patenting rejection.

9. Claim 19 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 5,334,640. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because in order to have a crosslinked composition, there had to be a crosslinkable composition to start with. One common inventor or a common assignee is sufficient for this rejection. The inventive entity does not have to be identical.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is 703-308-2460. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 7:00 a.m.-5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 703-306-2777. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



Peter Szekely
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

P.S.
June 19, 2003